



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

peacefully persuade the public from patronizing their store. *Held*, an injunction would not be granted restraining the defendants.

Questions of this sort frequently arise and the decisions are by no means uniform. Where one knowingly injures another he must show justification or privilege. Here public policy is the justification. 8 *Har. Law Rev.* 1. The recent decisions which separate picketing and peaceful persuasion from all circumstances of threat warrant the refusal to enjoin. *Allen v. Flood*, (1898) App. Cas. 1; Justice Holmes in *Vegeahn v. Guntner*, 167 Mass. 92.

MASTER AND SERVANT—FELLOW SERVANT.—*ORMAN ET AL. V. SALVO*, 117 FED. 223.—Workmen engaged in constructing a railroad grade were divided into day and night shifts. A member of the night shift was injured by a blast, of which no notice was given, while sleeping in a tent provided by the master. *Held*, that the fellow servant doctrine did not apply.

In *Washburn v. Nashville & C. R. Co.*, 40 Tenn. 638, the rule is well stated that one is not a fellow servant unless at the time of the injury he was acting in the service of the master. The following cases illustrate this principle; a deck hand not on duty, *Ry Co. v. Ross*, 112 U. S. 377; a section boss, killed while crossing tracks on way home from work, *Columbus & T. R. Co. v. O'Brien*, 4 Ohio Cir. Ct. 515; an employee of a factory, injured by negligence of co-employee in leaving street in front of factory in a defective and dangerous condition, *Baird v. Pettit*, 70 Pa. 477. *Contra*, railroad employee injured while on cars, but off duty, *Ry. Co. v. Ryan*, 82 Tex. 565; *Ry. Co. v. Welch*, 72 Tex. 298.

MINORS—NECESSARIES—COUNSEL FEES.—*CRAFTS V. CARR*, 53 ATL. 275 (R. I.).—An action for damages for indecent assault was successfully prosecuted by an attorney for a 17-year-old minor. After judgment, the minor attempted to enter into a disadvantageous compromise of the claim, but by the attorney's efforts the full amount was collected. *Held*, that the services of the attorney were necessities.

There is no unanimity among the authorities as to what shall be the test to determine whether services rendered by an attorney to a minor are necessities. A large class of cases hold that services rendered in relation to property are not necessities. *Dillon v. Bowles*, 77 Mo. 603; 16 *Am. & Eng. Ency. Law* 275 (2nd ed.). Some authorities adopt this rule excepting from it, however, services that are beneficial to the infant's estate. *Epperson v. Nugent*, 57 Miss. 45. Probably the best test, and the one sanctioned by the court in this case, is that no services shall be deemed necessities unless indispensable to the personal relief, protection and support of the infant. *Munson v. Washband*, 31 Conn. 303; *Barker v. Hibbard*, 54 N. H. 339.

NEGLIGENCE—INJURIES TO CHILDREN—LIABILITY OF LANDOWNER.—*PAOLINO V. MCKENDALL*, 53 ATL. 268 (R. I.).—Where an occupant of premises on which children were accustomed to play, set a fire thereon, and a young child was attracted thereby and burned, the occupant, though he had taken no precautionary measures, was *held* not liable for the injuries.

This case involves an application of the rule in the so-called "turn-table cases," established by the Supreme Court in *Railroad Co. v. Stout*, 17 Wall. 657. It was there held that an owner of machinery or other property attractive to children, is liable for injuries happening to them, although wrongfully interfering with such property on his premises. The court